

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the application based upon the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Shapiro in the December 6, 2006 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action, in paragraph 4, states that claims 5, 6, 8, 12, 13 and 21 recite allowable subject matter. Specifically, the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant appreciates this indication of allowability, but respectfully submits that claims 2 and 16 from which these claims directly or indirectly depend, are allowable for the reasons set forth below.

The Office Action, in paragraph 1, objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the drawings do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims, *i.e.*, "which the scanning line corresponding to the pixel in which data should be written is selected to a time point at which the scanning line is next selected." The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to at least Fig. 6 which illustrates elements SEL1, SEL(a) and SEL(b) and as described in at least paragraphs [0070]-[0081] of the Applicant's disclosure. The various scanning lines are shown as selected, based on the areas A, B and C, within the boundaries of the one vertical scanning period.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings adequately illustrate every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant's representatives

discussed this issue with the Examiner during the December 6 personal interview. The Examiner agreed that the drawings adequately depicted all of the claimed features.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 3, rejects claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 14-20, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,859,193 to Yumoto. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office Action asserts that Yumoto teaches the features positively recited in independent claims 1, 2, 15 and 16. However, Yumoto does not teach that the drive mode can be selected according to the various display areas. A drive mode selecting service circuit, that selects a drive mode of each of the plurality of pixels, depends upon the display areas or a unit of the scanning line positively recited in amended claims 1, 2, 15 and 16. Yumoto teaches, as illustrated in Fig. 20C, a single continuous extinguishing signal, and therefore, does not teach that the drive mode can be selected based upon the position of the display area. Yumoto teaches a current drive circuit and display device using the same pixel circuit, and drive method.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not support a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to Yumoto.

Applicant's representatives presented the above arguments in support of the allowability of at least the pending independent claims. The Examiner agreed to reconsider these arguments upon filing a formal response.

For at least the above reasons, Yumoto cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or even to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 2, 15 and 16. Further, claims 3, 4 and 17-23 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested by the applied prior art references for at least the respective dependence


of these claims on allowable independent claims 1, 2, 15 and 16 as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the subject matter of claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 14-20, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yumoto are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 14-20, 22 and 23, in addition to the indication of allowability of claims 5, 6, 8, 12, 13 and 21, are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III  
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT/jam

Date: December 8, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--